

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 - 9, 11, 13, 15 - 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33 - 36, 38 and 39 are pending in the present application. Claims 2, 10, 12, 14, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 37 and 40 are canceled. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation that in section 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 10, 22, 37 and 40 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Rather than rewriting claims 10, 22, 37 and 40, Applicants are rewriting independent claims 1, 13, 25, 33, 35 and 38 to include relevant recitals that were previously presented in claims 10, 22, 37 and 40. Thus, Applicants believe that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

In section 1 of the Office Action, claims 10 and 22 are objected to. Applicants are canceling claims 10 and 22, and as such, the objection thereof is rendered moot. A withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

In section 2 of the Office Action, claim 38 is objected to because of an informality. Applicants are amending claim 38 to address the informality. A withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

In section 3 of the Office Action, claim 40 is objected to because of an informality. Applicants are amending claim 40 to address the informality. A withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3 - 11, 25, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, the Office Action indicates that there does not appear to be a tangible result.

This set of rejected claims contains two independent claims, namely claims 1 and 25. Applicants are amending claims 1 and 25 to provide a tangible result. Accordingly, claims 1 and 25 are now directed toward statutory subject matter.

Claim 10 is canceled. As such, the rejection of claim 10 is rendered moot.

Claims 3 - 9, 11 and 27 depend from claim 1, and claim 31 depends from claim 25. By virtue of these dependencies, claims 3 - 9, 11, 27 and 29 are also directed toward statutory subject matter.

Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the section 101 rejection of claims 1, 3 - 11, 25, 27 and 31.

In sections 6 - 11 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3 - 9, 11, 13, 15 - 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33 - 36, 38 and 39 are rejected. Of this set of claims, six are independent, namely claims 1, 13, 25, 33, 35 and 38. As mentioned above, Applicants are rewriting independent claims 1, 13, 25, 33, 35 and 38 to include relevant recitals that were previously presented in claims 10, 22, 37 and 40. More particularly:

- (a) claim 1 is rewritten to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 10;
- (b) claim 13 is rewritten to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 22;
- (c) claim 25 is rewritten to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 10;
- (d) claim 33 is rewritten to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 22;
- (e) claim 35 is rewritten to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 37; and
- (f) claim 38 is rewritten to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 40.

Applicants further amended claims 1, 13, 25, 33, 35 and 38 to accommodating the above-noted rewriting, and amended claims 3 - 9, 15 - 20, 27, 29, 31, 34, 36 and 39 for consistency with the claims from which they depend.

Applicants believe that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in sections 6 - 11 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Date

24 JAN 2007

Respectfully submitted,

John Yankovich

Reg. No. 42,240

Attorney for the Applicants

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10th Floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

Tel: 203-327-4500

Fax: 203-327-6401